



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,113	07/10/2000	Dirk Husemann	SZ-9-99-017 (728-167)	8808

7590

02/18/2004

Paul J Barrese  
Dilworth & Barrese  
333 Earl Ovington Boulevard  
Uniondale, NY 11553

EXAMINER
----------

HUYNH, BA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/613,113

Applicant(s)

HUSEMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Ba Huynh

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

BA HUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-11, 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent #6,466,971 (Humbleman et al).

- As for claim 1, 16: Humbleman et al teach a computer implement method and corresponding system for controlling a first computer device 14 having limited user interface using a remote second computer 12, whereby computers 14 and 12 communicate via a wireless communication channel (1:61-67) and support a common communication protocol (5:5-17; 6:10-19), the method/system comprising the steps/means for:

transmitting the limited user interface information from the first computer device 14 to the second computer 12 (5:46-50),

providing an extended user interface at the second computer device corresponding to the limited user interface information (5:50-54),

receiving user input via the extended user interface at the second computer 12,

transmitting user command information corresponding to the user input from the second computer to the first computer device, and executing the corresponding user commands at the first computer 14 (5:54-56).

- As for claim 2: The interface information is a standardized user interface description (6:11-19).

Art Unit: 2173

- As for claims 4, 17: The wireless communication channel is automatically established between the computers without user intervention (5:45-56).
- As for claims 5, 18: The second computer having a display for displaying the user interface (5:22-26).
- As for claims 6, 19: The second computer 14 comprising a keyboard (5:22-24).
- As for claims 9, 20: The second computer 14 browses the GCO structure data for displaying the user interface (5:47-49).
- As for claim 10: Humpleman's teaching of remote control (1:61-65) implicitly includes a wireless communication protocol for transmitting information between the computers.
- As for claim 11: A HTTP is used for transmitting user command information between the computers (12:6-9).
- As for claims 15, 21: Second computer initiates a request for GUI information (5:46-48).
- As for claim 22: The system further includes a third computer 96, which third computer 14 inherently includes a processor, a transceiver, and a memory for storing user interface information (5:39-64;figure 19).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. Claims 3, 7-8, 12-14, 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent #6,466,971 (Humpleman et al).

Art Unit: 2173

- As for claim 3: Humpleman fails to clearly teach that the second computer transmits a list of services to the first computer prior to the first computer sending user interface information. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the transmission a list of services from the second computer to the first computer prior to the first computer sending user interface information to Humpleman's teaching of universal remote control. Motivation of the implementation is for advertising to the first computer the type of services the universal remote controller possesses.
- As for claims 7, 8: Humpleman fails to teach that a WML is used for transmitting the user interface information from the first computer to the second computer. However implementation of WML is well known in the art of user interface for devices having limited user input capability. Thus it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known WML to Humpleman's teaching of transmitting user interface information. Motivation of the combining is for the advantage of allowing the rendering device the flexibility to render the user interface in the best manner (see US patent #6,446,096, 5:18-29).
- As for claims 12, 13: Humpleman fails to clearly teach the confirmation signal. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the confirmation signal notifying the user the completion of an executed command.
- As for claim 14: Humpleman fails to clearly teach that the first computer initiates communication. However, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the

time the invention was made, to implement the first computer initiates communication by sending the GUI information. Motivation of the implementation is for speeding up the interaction.

- As for claim 23, 24: User interface information of the first computer 14 (device B) can be stored in an Interface library 80 at the third computer 96 and can be downloaded to second computer 12 (device A) responsive to a query from the second computer (18:25-37; figure 19). Each of the devices includes pointer and handler (16:59-62). Thus it appears that first computer 14 (device B) provides a pointer to second computer 12 (device A) indicating a memory location in the third device 96 where interface information of the first computer 14 is stored so that second computer can retrieve the interface information. Even if it is not, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the providing of the pointer from first device 14 to second computer 12 for indication the store location of the user information. Motivation of the implementation is for the ease of processing speed by having the data readily available to the second computer.
- As for claims 25, 26: Humpleman et al teach a computer implement method and corresponding system for controlling a first computer device 14 having limited user interface using a remote second computer 12, whereby computers 14 and 12 communicate via a wireless communication channel (1:61-67) and support a common communication protocol (5:5-17; 6:10-19), the method/system comprising the steps/means for:

Art Unit: 2173

transmitting the limited user interface information from the first computer device 14 to the second computer 12 (5:46-50),

providing an extended user interface at the second computer device corresponding to the user interface information (5:50-54),

receiving user input via the extended user interface at the second computer 12, transmitting user command information corresponding to the user input from the second computer to the first computer device, and executing the corresponding user commands at the first computer 14 (5:54-56).

Humpleman fails to clearly teach the confirmation signal. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the confirmation signal notifying the user the completion of an executed command.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### **REMARKS:**

In response to the argument that Humpleman does not teach “transmitting the limited user interface information from at least one first device to the at least one second device”, the limitation is disclosed by Humpleman in col. 5, lines 46-50, wherein user interface description GCO 22 from the server 14 is transmitted to the second device 12. In response to the argument that Humpleman does not teach “providing an extended user interface on the second device, the extended user interface corresponding to the transmitted limited user interface information”, the

Art Unit: 2173

limitation is disclosed by Humpleman in col. 5, lines 50-54, wherein the second device 12 then use the transmitted GCO 22 to create a control user interface 18 for the user to communicate with the control program 20 of the server 14 from the second device 12 over the network. Thus from a limited user interface information GCO 22 an extended GUI 18 is created in which the user of the second device does not require a built-in knowledge of the particular server device (6:18-20).

### *Conclusion*

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2173

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ba Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9794. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeza can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ba Huynh  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2173  
2/16/04

**BA HUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**